

Appl. No. 09/778,553
Amdt. dated January 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 42 were pending in the application at the time of examination. The Examiner objected to FIG.s 1 to 5 under MPEP 608.02(g). The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372). The Examiner rejected Claims 4 to 14, 18 to 28 and 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

Claims 1 to 42 remain in the Application.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to FIG.s 1 to 5 under MPEP 608.02(g).

As shown above, five sheets of replacement drawings have been included with this response. The attached five sheets of drawings include changes to FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5. These five sheets, which includes FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5, replaces the original sheets including FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5 and includes the requested legend "Prior Art" requested by the Examiner.

In light of the attached five sheets of drawings including changes to FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the objection to FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 AND 31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Appl. No. 09/778,553
Amdt. dated January 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached five (5) sheets of drawings include changes to FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5.

In FIG.1, the legend (Prior Art) has been added.

In FIG.2, the legend (Prior Art) has been added.

In FIG.3, the legend (Prior Art) has been added.

In FIG.4, the legend (Prior Art) has been added.

In FIG.5, the legend (Prior Art) has been added.

These five (5) sheets, which includes FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5, replaces the original sheets including FIG.1, FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5.

Attachment: Five (5) Replacement Sheets

Appl. No. 09/778,553
Amdt. dated January 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2004

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

The Examiner has stated, with emphasis added:

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 29, Krause discloses **identifying a plurality of events, storing a plurality of states associated with the document upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, and obtaining the desired state using the plurality of states in col.1, lines 42-59 and col.2 lines 6-10.

Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement that Krause teaches storing a plurality of states associated with the document **upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, Krause specifically teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question.

Column 1, lines 42 to 59, of Krause, cited by the Examiner, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

If multiple undo capability is provided, then the document proceeds through its prior states in a linear manner. Similarly, when changes are saved by version number, the user can usually easily only get back to the immediately prior version. If multiple versions are saved, then the user must execute a command which causes a list of prior versions to be displayed from which the user can select one prior version to open to replace the current version stored in volatile memory.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

A method and an apparatus are disclosed for saving prior versions of a document so that the user has complete control of which versions of the

Appl. No. 09/778,553
Amdt. dated January 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2004

document are saved, while providing a mechanism for easy retrieval of saved versions. The invention utilizes a set of icons on a screen display **which when selected by a pointer device perform an action depending upon the state of the selected icon which may be one of three states.**

Column 2, lines 6 to 10, of Krause, cited by the Examiner, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A method and apparatus are disclosed which provide a mechanism for enabling **a user of a computer program to save multiple versions** of a document being worked on such that the current version can be easily saved and prior versions can be easily and selectively retrieved.

In addition, Column 2, lines 11 to 16, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

The mechanism is implemented as a computer program which displays a set of icons on a display device, **which icons, when selected by a user by operation of a pointing device, cause a predetermined action to be taken with respect to the image currently displayed on the visual display.** The image being displayed may represent any kind of a document such as a scanned picture in a bitmapped format, a word processing document, a spreadsheet document or any other type of document which may be represented on a computer screen.

Column 2, lines 35 to 39, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

Appl. No. 09/778,553
Amdt. dated January 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2004

The buttons or dots 15 are the icons which when selected by the user cause the current state of the document to be saved or replaced by a previously saved version of the image depending upon the state of the selected button or dot 15.

Column 3, lines 27 to 39, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

Logically, selection of dots or buttons 15 causes the following operations to be performed. If a button is in the empty state, selecting that button will cause a save operation to take place with respect to the currently displayed image and the selected button or dot will change so that it is displayed in the saved state (e.g., brown or black). If the button or dot is in the saved state when it is selected, then the displayed image is replaced with the image corresponding to the memory of the selected memory button, and the display of the selected button is changed to show a change of state to current (e.g., red or black and white pattern). If the selected button or dot is in the current state then no action is taken.

As seen above, Krause discloses that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, Krause specifically teaches away from storing a plurality of states associated with the document **upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, and instead teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show that the Krause reference discloses, teaches or suggests storing a plurality of states associated with the document **upon the**

occurrence of the plurality of events, as the Examiner has stated.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 15 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 2 and 3 depend on Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 2 and 3 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 depend on Claim 15. Consequently, Claims 16 and 17 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 15.

Claims 30 and 31 depend on Claim 29. Consequently, Claims 30 and 31 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 29.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2 and 3, Claims 16 and 17 and Claims 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4 TO 14, 18 TO 28 and 32 TO 42 under
35 U.S.C.103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 4 to 14, 18 to 28 and 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Krause discloses that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, Krause specifically teaches away from storing a plurality of states associated with the document **upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, and instead teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show that the Krause reference discloses, teaches or suggests storing a plurality of

states associated with the document **upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, as the Examiner has stated.

Claims 4 to 14 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 4 to 14 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1. Claims 18 to 28 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 15. Consequently, Claims 18 to 28 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 15. Claims 32 to 42 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 29. Consequently, Claims 32 to 42 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 29. In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4 to 14, Claims 18 to 28 and Claims 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 7, 2005.



Attorney for Applicants

January 7, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Philip J. McKay
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,966
Tel.: (831) 655-0880